

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

After entry of this amendment, claims 1-15, 19, 20, and 22-43 will be pending and presented for examination. Claims 16, 17, 18, and 21 have been cancelled in this response. Claims 15, 19, 20, 22, 23, and 27-32 are amended herein.

Claim Rejections 35 USC §102

In the May 6, 2004 Office Action, all claims were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,381,257 (Ershov).

Telephone Interview

On July 6, 2004, the undersigned attorney and Examiner Nguyen had an interview by telephone. Independent claims 1, 15, 33, 37, and 41 were discussed. It was agreed that claims 1 and 41 were patentable over Ershov because those claims include a grating in thermal contact with a heat sink, which is not disclosed in the Ershov patent. It was also agreed that claims 33 and 37 were patentable over Ershov because those claims include a line-narrowing module with a beam expander, an interferometric device, and a grating, which is not disclosed in the Ershov patent. No agreement was reached as to independent claim 15.

Patentability of Claim 15

In this response, Applicants present an amended claim 15 for consideration. Amended claim 15 is substantially claim 18 rewritten in independent form, including the limitations of intermediate claims 16 and 17. Amended claim 15 distinguishes over the Ershov patent because the claim requires a reflection grating inside the sealed enclosure, wherein the pressure inside the sealed enclosure is controlled for tuning the wavelength output by the line-narrowing module. Ershov discloses at Fig. 22E an etalon output coupler that has an etalon inside an enclosed chamber and a means for controlling the pressure therein, but Ershov's etalon output coupler is not a line-narrowing module as claimed and does not have a reflection grating therein. Ershov discloses at Fig. 12 a tuning device that includes a beam expander 37 and a grating 38, but does not include a pressure-controlled sealed enclosure.


Conclusion

For all the reasons stated above, Applicants request that the Examiner allow independent claims 1, 33, 37, and 41, as agreed in the telephone interview, and their corresponding dependent claims 2-14, 31, 34-36, 38-40, 42, and 43. Applicants further request the Examiner to reconsider the patentability of the remaining claims 15, 19, 20, and 22-32 in view of the amendments and comments above. If the undersigned can be of any help, please call at 415-772-4909.

Respectfully submitted,

STALLMAN & POLLOCK LLP

Dated: July 7, 2004

By: 
Stephen M. Everett
Reg. No. 30,050

Attorneys for Applicant(s)